

BEFORE THE  
POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20268-0001

STATUTORY REVIEW OF THE SYSTEM FOR )  
REGULATING RATES AND CLASSES FOR ) Docket No. RM2017-3  
MARKET DOMINANT PRODUCTS )

**COMMENTS OF THE AMERICAN MAIL ALLIANCE**

**(ALLIANCE OF NONPROFIT MAILERS, AMERICAN CATALOG MAILERS ASSOCIATION, INC., AMERICAN FOREST & PAPER ASSOCIATION, AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION, AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR CANCER RESEARCH, ASSOCIATION FOR POSTAL COMMERCE, ASSOCIATION FOR PRINT TECHNOLOGIES, ASSOCIATION OF DIRECT RESPONSE FUNDRAISING COUNSEL, ASSOCIATION OF FREE COMMUNITY PAPERS, CHESAPEAKE BAY FOUNDATION, COMMUNITY PAPERS OF FLORIDA, COMMUNITY PAPERS OF MICHIGAN, COMMUNITY PAPERS OF NEW ENGLAND, CONSUMER REPORTS, DATA & MARKETING ASSOCIATION (DMA), DATA-MAIL, INC., DIRECT MARKETING ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON, DIRECT MARKETING FUNDRAISERS ASSOCIATION, DMA NONPROFIT FEDERATION, THE ELKS MAGAZINE, ENVELOPE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, FOOD FOR THE POOR, FREE COMMUNITY PAPERS OF NEW YORK, GUIDEPOSTS, IDEALLIANCE, THE INDEPENDENT FREE PAPERS OF AMERICA, INTELISENT, IWCO DIRECT, JEWISH VOICE MINISTRIES INTERNATIONAL, LSC COMMUNICATIONS, MAJOR MAILERS ASSOCIATION, MID-ATLANTIC FREE PAPERS ASSOCIATION, MPA–THE ASSOCIATION OF MAGAZINE MEDIA, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRESORT MAILERS, NATIONAL CATHOLIC DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE, NATIONAL NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION, NATIONAL POSTAL POLICY COUNCIL, NATIONAL RETAIL FEDERATION, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, NEWS MEDIA ALLIANCE, OPERATION SMILE, PACIFIC NORTHWEST ASSOCIATION OF WANT AD PAPERS, PARCEL SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION, PRINTING INDUSTRIES OF AMERICA, QUAD/GRAPHICS, SATURATION MAILERS COALITION, SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, INC., SOUTHEASTERN ADVERTISING PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION, WISCONSIN COMMUNITY PAPERS, AND WOUNDED WARRIOR PROJECT)**

March 1, 2018

The undersigned associations and individual signers<sup>1</sup> have come together as the American Mail Alliance (“AMA”) for the sole and limited purpose of showing unanimity in asking the Postal Regulatory Commission (Commission) to reconsider its proposed solution for the U.S. Postal Service’s financial challenges.

AMA’s members collectively represent the great majority of mail volume – and revenue – in the Market Dominant segment of the mail stream, and their suppliers. The undersigned AMA members – associations, corporations, non-profit organizations, and other postal stakeholders – are united in the belief that, contrary to restoring financial stability to the Postal Service, the Commission’s proposal will drive a great deal more volume and revenue out of the system, imperiling businesses, jobs, and the Service itself. Business mailers, a very broad segment of which are in the combined membership of our associations, largely fund the provision of universal postal service in the United States and are heavily invested in the future of the Postal Service. Many of us will be submitting our own comments or alternative proposals. But we all strongly oppose the Commission proposal to solve the complex problems of the Postal Service with the single solution of rate increases much higher than inflation.

The Commission’s proposal will not solve the Postal Service’s financial “problems” and will, we believe, cause lasting damage to the Postal Service and to the \$1.4 trillion mailing industry – and the 7.5 million jobs it supports – which depend on the Postal Service for communications, correspondence, fundraising, and commerce. Although we represent business interests and nonprofit organizations, through our frequent interactions with them, we can also speak to the interests of America’s citizens and consumers who have come to rely on the Postal Service; the one “utility” and service that binds the nation together and is still “free” to every residential and business recipient. This valued service, which for many is their one regular contact with the federal government, could be jeopardized by the drastic increases in postal rates that will result from the Commission proposal.

---

<sup>1</sup> Additional parties who have requested to be identified as supporting these comments are listed in Attachment A.

**I. THE POSTAL SERVICE’S POOR FINANCES ARE NOT ‘DUE TO’ DEFICIENCIES IN THE RATE-MAKING SYSTEM.**

In its orders, the Commission largely agrees that the current rate-setting system is achieving the objectives and factors of the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (PAEA). The Commission’s chief concern appears to be that Postal Service finances are poor and that the Postal Service has not been able to achieve medium- and long-term financial stability. We submit, however, that these shortcomings are not “due to” any deficiency in the rate-setting system. They are due primarily to the Congressional retiree health prefunding mandate that was set up for Congressional Budget Office (CBO) “scoring” purposes and, while the Postal Service was flush, to “pay for” the full liability for retiree health care from postage. While this “pay for” enabled passage of a bill that gave the Postal Service some new flexibilities and opportunities to manage its own business and prices, it saddled USPS with an unprecedentedly massive prefunding obligation that has been a drag on the system, and has dramatically weakened the Postal Service’s balance sheet since PAEA was enacted.

Having begun the PAEA era with a financial handicap, the Service’s situation was immediately worsened when expectations of continuing growth in postal volumes proved wrong; diversion of First-Class Mail to electronic alternatives accelerated with the introduction of the iPhone and the advent of social media. Then, the Postal Service and mailing industry were both damaged by the Great Recession. Moreover, rather than pursue a strategic default, the Postal Service used its limited borrowing power to make unsustainable prefunding payments until it exhausted its \$15 billion borrowing authority.

Over 90 percent of Postal Service losses in the last decade are “due to” this misguided prefunding. Evidence submitted in Phase I of this rulemaking proceeding shows that the Postal Service is better funded for retiree benefits than any other federal, state, or private sector entity. In total, more than \$340 billion are already set aside in the U.S. Treasury for that purpose. Further, data before this Commission show that USPS obligations are overestimated while its assets are undervalued. The other shortcomings the Commission finds in its rate review – not maintaining high quality

service standards and not increasing price efficiency – could be ameliorated without burdening mailers with prices that are significantly higher than the rate of inflation for the next five years.

We submit that the Commission should focus on consequences that are “due to” the rate-setting process, rather than the consequences of actions of Congress. If the Commission were to appropriately narrow its focus in this way, it would agree that the current system should continue with the rate cap in place. There is no need for the Commission to take action now. Additional rate authority should not be given unless, or until, the Postal Service’s actual business of delivering the mail requires Commission intervention. The Commission has the right to review the rate-setting process at any time in the future. Now is not the time to devastate the entire mailing industry with higher costs “due to” the financial pressures overwhelmingly created by the prefunding requirement.

## **II. THE COMMISSION PROPOSAL PUTS TOO MUCH WEIGHT ON A SINGLE OBJECTIVE.**

As noted above, the Commission largely finds the PAEA system has provided a vastly improved ratemaking environment. Mailers agree. No one wants to see cost of service rate-making return. For most stakeholders in the industry, predictability, rate stability, and transparency have been achieved. The current system has met mailer needs and funded ongoing USPS operations.

But when it comes to the future of ratemaking, among all of the relevant Objectives and Factors, the Commission appears to unduly focus on Objective 5, the Postal Service’s financial stability, at the expense of other objectives. Objective 5 not only has been treated as first among equals, it has virtually overshadowed the balance of the objectives set out as equals by Congress in PAEA. The notion that “someone” should pay whatever is needed to help the Postal Service achieve medium-term stability, and even build up retained earnings as some sort of entitlement, puts Postal Service finances before all other Factors and Objectives of the rulemaking.

This was not the intent of Congress in PAEA. Had it been, Congress would have written it that way. “Adequate revenues” would have stood first and foremost or would have been singled out in the law as some “prime directive.” But it was not written that way. Notably, the first stated objective is to maximize incentives to reduce costs and increase efficiency. Indeed, in its Order and Determination, the Commission stated that the CPI cap is an indispensable tool to provide incentives for Postal Service management to control costs. Adding yearly surcharges totaling 3 to 5 percentage points above CPI to achieve Objective 5 is inconsistent with the other Objectives and requirements of the law. It defies logical explanation, to those who must foot the bill of this great network, that all other Objectives are subordinated to improve mid- to long-term financial performance.

There is no assurance in this proposal that the Postal Service will start meeting its service standards. For every shortcoming identified in the 10-year lookback, the only parties required to suffer any consequences, through vastly higher rates, are the mailers. The proposed rulemaking puts one Objective above them all. This is not what the law requires. Although the Postal Service has repeatedly failed to follow suggestions made by the Commission in the past, and the Commission is attempting to compel the Postal Service to set prices that are more efficient or related to costs in the future, the proposal from the Commission does not compel or incentivize the Postal Service to reduce costs. It only, to be blunt, throws money at the problem. This is not a formula for medium-, and certainly long-term, stabilization.

There is no reason within the current scheme of postal ratemaking that the Postal Service cannot be asked, and expected, to achieve improvements in service and more efficient pricing. The Commission has had that power in its annual compliance review and rate review proceedings all along. This is not the time to confine the solution to mailers through punishing and unaffordable price increases for at least 5 more years.

### **III. TWO WRONGS DON'T MAKE A RIGHT.**

The Commission ruling in the 10-year rate review, and its resulting rulemaking, largely stem from the Commission's acceptance of the Postal Service's \$62 billion in retirement liabilities “as a given” that the Commission must accept and that it alone must

repair. The red ink and accumulated debt on the Postal Service's balance sheet have been baked into the Postal Service's reported finances by ill-conceived prefunding mandates in the PAEA. Though many in the industry have tried mightily to enact legislative fixes to what is clearly a legislative problem, those fixes have proven elusive. In determining that it must offset these obligations with rate increases, the Commission compounds the problem and the error of the fundamental assumption in PAEA that USPS could indefinitely fund such crushing payments.

We respectfully disagree with that determination. This is a Congressional problem that needs a Congressional solution. The Postal Service has defaulted on this debt for several years without consequence. The Treasury is not about to foreclose on the Postal Service. Although the red ink looks bad, it does not have any practical consequences for the Postal Service in terms of its ability to fulfill its mission. In spite of a historically low period of inflation over the past 10 years, and the Great Recession, the Postal Service is still covering its operating expenses.

We agree that this is a problem and it should be fixed. But it is the job of Congress, not the Commission. Moreover, the proposed fix is flawed. In its zeal to rescue the Postal Service from red ink, the Commission has applied a simple, single solution to a complex problem. It requires a more nuanced approach.

By proposing only one solution – much higher postage rates – the Commission has succumbed to the fallacy that one response can fix a complex problem with multiple causes. The Commission recognized those multiple causes for the Postal Service's financial difficulties that were set out in stark relief in our initial comments. The Commission evidently was not swayed that these multiple causes require multiple solutions, and not just a major, deeply counterproductive increase in rates. The Commission in this crisis has failed to invoke the full scope of its authority to shape Postal Service behavior on costs through price incentives and *disincentives*. With respect, we believe the Commission short-changes the Postal Service and the customers for whom it is a check and balance if higher rates are its only focus to address deficiencies in postal finances and service.

The Commission's proposal for 5 years of rate increases that are utterly noncompetitive when the Postal Service's inability to compete on current price constructs is manifest – as surprise declines in mail in the past 2 years demonstrate – has no prospect of making things right.

#### **IV. THE COMMISSION PROPOSAL WILL DO MORE HARM THAN GOOD.**

AMA's members unanimously believe that the Commission rulemaking proposal will do lasting harm to the Postal Service. It will put many mail and supply chain stakeholders out of business, force them out of the mail, or push them to find – or create – alternative, cheaper, and more stable distribution methods. We understand that some on the Commission or Commission staff may believe that Postal Service volumes are inelastic, and that the Postal Service can pass on price increases and the industry will just “take it.” Some point to the industry's survival during exigency as “proof” that mail volumes did not suffer lasting declines.

All of us disagree with that assessment of the impact of the exigency increase and conclusion. But importantly, we must stress that exigency was different. It was clearly a short-term response to the Great Recession. Many in the industry fought to oppose and ameliorate the increase, and to roll it back, throughout protracted Commission proceedings. It was NOT a forever increase in the costs of doing business with the Postal Service. Users of the mail could anticipate an eventual return to the CPI price cap. Under the Commission's proposed solution there is no reason for similar optimism on the part of companies deciding whether or not to continue in the mail.

The proposed rule comes at a time when the Postal Service is fighting to retain business. Prior years of operations in or near the black under the stability of the rate cap raised industry's confidence level that the Postal Service, working within the CPI cap, could remain a cost competitive service provider, even with some diversion of mail. But the Postal Service is challenged by decreasing demand in its Market Dominant products – precisely the ones facing these counterproductive increases. What rational business dramatically raises price in a competitive environment of reduced demand? Irrespective of historical elasticity debates, and claims of mailers “crying wolf,” we believe this proposal will be the tipping point leading to even more – this time massive –

permanent reductions in mail volumes.

The Commission proposal essentially announces to the world that the Postal Service will be charging much higher prices for at least the next 5 years and, for some products, will be charging prices that are double or triple the rate of inflation. It is like hanging a neon sign on every mail truck that reads: "Same service – new higher prices!"

For those of us who survived the exigency increase, we can assure you that our customers did not simply "pay more." Many of us struggled to stay in the mail by demanding efficiencies and price commitments from our other supply chain providers that have helped to offset increases in postage rates. We value the Postal Service and want to keep it healthy and able to continue to reach every home and business in the country. We genuinely fear that this proposal could prove a cure that is worse than the disease, and quite possibly fatal to the system's self-sustaining business model.

## **V. CONCERN FOR UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES**

We feel compelled to also respond directly to the extra 2 percent annually proposed for "underwater" products. Not all of the undersigned stakeholders agree, or have one voice, when it comes to the challenge of underwater products. We all agree that every Postal Service product, including those under water, should "pay its fair share." To varying degrees, we have significant reservations about whether the Postal Service has made wise operating choices in handling certain types of mail, including "underwater products." But, the plain truth is that for those products, an extra 2 percent per year on top of the huge base rate change proposed for all Market Dominant products, compounded, will be devastating.

And that devastation will directly and severely impact all mail. Among those mailers producing underwater products are charitable organizations, local newspapers, catalogs, and magazines. Along with checks, credit cards, statements of accounts, various insurance documents, and other vital communications, the fundraising, news, features and opinions, and advertising products give consumers strong reason to go to the mailbox – forming the "Mail Moment" when consumers interact with the mail and often generate more business or contributions, not to mention more mail volume. In a



declining business, such as the Postal Service's market dominant mail sector, the last thing that should be done is to dampen an incentive for consumer interaction with the mail. Nonetheless, the rates proposed by the Commission overall, punctuated by the "kicker" to underwater products, not just dampen, but outright wash away, that incentive.

The Commission proposal does little or nothing to challenge the Postal Service to take lasting steps to streamline costs. Instead, by simply mandating much higher prices, it removes the pivotal incentive to cut costs. The industry believes that it is hardly a coincidence that the Postal Service achieved larger cost savings when constrained by a rate cap. In addition, these higher prices will deter the Postal Service and mailers from exploring products or prices that could help the Postal Service gain market volumes and improve its competitive position.

For the many businesses and associations below that work to bring customers to the mail, the Commission has made our job that much harder. For those that would like to "break up" the postal monopoly, five years of above-market price increases may be a rallying cry to end the mail box monopoly and open the mail box to competition. That would create turmoil and more uncertainty in a wobbling and declining industry by sparking a major divide between those who would wish to maintain and those who would wish to abolish that monopoly. Certainly, this proposal would stimulate demand, and create economies of scale, for alternative delivery services. With so many on Capitol Hill and at Beltway think-tanks willing to consider various privatization scenarios, this proposal provides fuel for those seeking to alter the status quo, with unforeseen consequences for universal service, prices, and the overall future of the system.

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

Thanks to an irresponsibly aggressive prefunding schedule, the Postal Service's balance sheet is colored in red. The Postal Service faces intensifying pressure from substitutes for its core market dominant products and declining demand as shown by disappointing letter and flat volumes. On the other hand, it continues to generate around \$70 billion in annual revenues and has an unmatched delivery network.

We are at a critical juncture. The outcome of this proceeding may help turn the Postal Service around and preserve a viable postal system for decades. Alternatively, by trying to solve a complex tangle of issues with a lone tool, the Commission may be inadvertently hastening the demise of the Postal Service. The risks are too great. We recognize that the Commission's powers are limited, but those limits should not lead the Commission to overplay its hand.

The Postal Service is a unique institution, which makes comparisons with other businesses tricky. But this is not the first time a venerable enterprise with a long history has confronted a crisis. The history of U.S. commerce is brightened by companies that have achieved remarkable turnarounds. Corporations such as Apple, Chrysler, Disney, HP, IBM, and others have faced near disaster. The key to a successful turnaround or reinvention often depends on a particular set of circumstances, but there is one thing you will not find. There is no precedent for an organization in any industry that succeeded through exorbitant price increases in the face of weak demand.

AMA members want the Postal Service to succeed. In many ways we have supported the Postal Service's efforts to adapt to its changing environment. However, we all gravely feel that the Commission's proposal is a poor choice and, if it takes effect, the Postal Service's future may look more like Woolworths or Eastern Airlines or Blockbuster or Radio Shack.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen M. Kearney  
Executive Director  
ALLIANCE OF NONPROFIT MAILERS  
1211 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 610  
Washington DC 20036  
(202) 462-5132  
[steve@nonprofitmailers.org](mailto:steve@nonprofitmailers.org)

Hamilton Davison  
President & Executive Director  
AMERICAN CATALOG MAILERS ASSOCIATION,  
INC.  
PO Box 41211  
Providence, RI 02940-1211  
800-509-9514  
[hdavison@catalogmailers.org](mailto:hdavison@catalogmailers.org)

Mark Pitts  
Executive Director, Printing-Writing Papers, Pulp and  
Tissue  
AMERICAN FOREST & PAPER ASSOCIATION  
1101 K Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 463-2764  
[Mark\\_Pitts@afandpa.org](mailto:Mark_Pitts@afandpa.org)

Sherry Minton  
Director, Direct Response  
American Heart Association  
7272 Greenville Ave  
Dallas, Texas 75231  
(214) 706-1422  
[sherry.minton@heart.org](mailto:sherry.minton@heart.org)

Kelly B. Browning  
Executive Vice President  
American Institute for Cancer Research (AICR)  
1560 Wilson Blvd  
Suite 1000  
Arlington, VA 22209  
202-328-7744  
[k.browning@aicr.org](mailto:k.browning@aicr.org)

Robert S. Tigner, General Counsel  
Assn of Direct Response Fundraising Counsel  
(ADRFCO)  
1319 F St NW Ste 402  
Washington, DC 20004-1112  
202.293.9640  
[adrco@msn.com](mailto:adrco@msn.com)

Donna Hanbery  
Counsel  
Association of Free Community Papers (AFCP)  
135 Old Cove Road, Suite 210  
Liverpool, New York 13090  
612-340-9350  
[hanbery@hnclaw.com](mailto:hanbery@hnclaw.com)

Michael K Plunkett  
President & CEO  
Association for Postal Commerce  
1800 Diagonal Rd Suite 600  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
[michaelplunkett@postcom.org](mailto:michaelplunkett@postcom.org)

Mark J. Nuzzaco  
Vice President, Government Affairs  
Association for Print Technologies (*formerly NPES*)  
1899 Preston White Drive  
Reston, VA 20191  
703.264.7235  
[mnuzzaco@aptech.org](mailto:mnuzzaco@aptech.org)

Amelia Koch  
Director of Membership  
Chesapeake Bay Foundation  
6 Herndon Avenue  
Annapolis, MD 21403  
410-268-8816  
[akoch@cbf.org](mailto:akoch@cbf.org)

Donna Hanbery  
Counsel  
Community Papers of Florida (CPF)  
P.O. BOX 1149  
Summerfield, FL 34492-1149  
612-340-9350  
[hanbery@hnclaw.com](mailto:hanbery@hnclaw.com)

Donna Hanbery  
Counsel  
Community Papers of Michigan (CPM)  
1451 East Lansing Drive Suite 213-B  
East Lansing, MI 48823  
612-340-9350  
[hanbery@hnclaw.com](mailto:hanbery@hnclaw.com)

Donna Hanbery  
Counsel  
Community Papers of New England (CPNE)  
100-1 Domino Drive  
Concord, MA 01742  
877-423-6399  
[hanbery@hnclaw.com](mailto:hanbery@hnclaw.com)

Meta A. Brophy  
Director, Procurement Operations  
Consumer Reports  
101 Truman Ave.  
Yonkers, NY 10703  
914-378-2614  
[mbrophy@consumer.org](mailto:mbrophy@consumer.org)

Bruce Mandell  
President  
Data-Mail, Inc.  
240 Hartford Ave  
Newington, CT 06111  
[brucem@data-mail.com](mailto:brucem@data-mail.com)

Emmett O'Keefe  
Senior Vice President, Advocacy  
Data & Marketing Association  
225 Reinekers Lane, Suite 325  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
202-861-2410  
[eokeefe@thedma.org](mailto:eokeefe@thedma.org)

Donna Tschiffely  
Executive Director  
Direct Marketing Association of Washington  
11709 Bowman Green Drive  
Reston, VA 20190  
703-689-3629  
[Donna@dmaw.org](mailto:Donna@dmaw.org)

Joseph W. Gomez  
Vice President  
Direct Marketing Fundraisers Association (DMFA)  
P.O. Box 51  
Tenafly, NJ 07670  
516-429-6143  
[jgomez@psmail.com](mailto:jgomez@psmail.com)

Xenia "Senny" Boone  
Executive Director  
DMA Nonprofit Federation  
225 Reinekers Lane, Suite 325  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
202-861-2498  
[sboone@thedma.org](mailto:sboone@thedma.org)

Phil Claiborne, PDD  
Director of Circulation  
The Elks Magazine  
Benevolent & Protective Order of the Elks of the USA  
425 W Diversey Pkwy  
Chicago, IL 60614-6193  
773-755-4910  
[philc@elks.org](mailto:philc@elks.org)

Maynard H. Benjamin  
President and CEO  
Envelope Manufacturers Association (EMA)  
700 S. Washington Street, Suite 260  
Alexandria, VA 22314-1565  
703-739-2200  
[mhbenjamin@envelope.org](mailto:mhbenjamin@envelope.org)

Angel A. Aloma  
Executive Director  
Food For The Poor  
6401 Lyons Road  
Coconut Creek, FL 33073  
954-427-2222 ext. 6100  
[aaloma@foodforthe poor.com](mailto:aaloma@foodforthe poor.com)

Donna Hanbery  
Counsel  
Free Community Papers of New York  
(FCPNY)/Ad Network NY  
109 Twin Oaks Drive, Suite C2  
Syracuse, NY 13206  
612-340-9350  
[Hanbery@hnclaw.com](mailto:Hanbery@hnclaw.com)

James Asselmeyer  
Vice President  
Guideposts  
39 Old Ridgebury Rd  
Danbury, CT 06810  
203-749-0244  
[jasselmeyer@guideposts.org](mailto:jasselmeyer@guideposts.org)

Pierre Ferrari  
President & CEO  
Heifer International  
1 World Ave  
Little Rock, AR 72202  
501-907-2600  
[pierre.ferrari@heifer.org](mailto:pierre.ferrari@heifer.org)

David J. Steinhardt  
President & CEO  
Idealliance  
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320  
Alexandria, VA 22314-2862  
703.837.1066  
[dsteinhardt@idealliance.org](mailto:dsteinhardt@idealliance.org)

Donna Hanbery  
Counsel  
The Independent Free Papers of America (IFPA)  
104 Westland Drive  
Columbia, TN 38401  
612-340-9350  
[hanbery@hnclaw.com](mailto:hanbery@hnclaw.com)

Mark Mandell  
President & CEO  
Intelisent  
597 North Mountain Road  
Newington, CT 06111  
[markm@intelisent.com](mailto:markm@intelisent.com)

James N. Andersen  
CEO  
IWCO Direct  
7951 Powers Blvd  
Chanhassen, MN 55317  
952-474-0961  
[jim.andersen@iwco.com](mailto:jim.andersen@iwco.com)

Matt Panos  
Chief Development Officer  
Jewish Voice Ministries International  
10850 N. 24<sup>th</sup> Ave  
Phoenix, AZ 85031  
602-538-3566  
[mpanos@jvmi.org](mailto:mpanos@jvmi.org)

Thomas J. Quinlan III  
Chairman and CEO  
LSC Communications  
99 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10016  
212-895-8802  
[tom.quinlan@lsc.com](mailto:tom.quinlan@lsc.com)



Mury Salls  
President  
Major Mailers Association  
11448 Chateaubriand Ave  
Orlando, FL 32836  
404-413-8535  
[mury.salls@broadridge.com](mailto:mury.salls@broadridge.com)

Donna Hanbery  
Counsel  
Mid-Atlantic Free Papers Association (MACPA)  
10 Zions Church Road, Suite 201  
Shoemakersville, PA 19555  
800-450-7227  
[hanbery@hnclaw.com](mailto:hanbery@hnclaw.com)

James R. Cregan  
Executive Vice President—Government Affairs  
MPA—The Association of Magazine Media  
1211 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 610  
Washington DC 20036  
(202) 296-7277  
[jcregan@magazine.org](mailto:jcregan@magazine.org)  
Robert Galaher  
Executive Director and CEO  
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRESORT MAILERS  
P.O. Box 3552  
Annapolis, MD 21403-3552  
877-620-6276  
[bob.galaher@presortmailers.org](mailto:bob.galaher@presortmailers.org)

Sr. Georgette Lehmuth, OSF  
President & CEO  
National Catholic Development Conference  
734 15<sup>th</sup> Street N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
202-637-0470  
[glehmuth@ncdc.org](mailto:glehmuth@ncdc.org)

Tonda F. Rush  
Counsel to National Newspaper Association  
CNLC  
200 Little Falls St, Suite 405  
Falls Church, VA 22046  
703-237-9801  
[tonda@nna.org](mailto:tonda@nna.org)

Arthur B. Sackler  
Executive Director  
National Postal Policy Council  
1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 900  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 955-0097  
[art.sackler@SBHLAWDC.COM](mailto:art.sackler@SBHLAWDC.COM)

David French  
Senior Vice President, Government Relations  
National Retail Federation  
1101 New York Ave NW  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
202-626-8112  
[frenchd@nrf.com](mailto:frenchd@nrf.com)

Sandra Miao  
Director, Membership  
National Wildlife Federation  
11100 Wildlife Center Drive  
Reston, VA 20190  
703-438-6204  
[miaos@nwf.org](mailto:miaos@nwf.org)

Paul Boyle  
Senior Vice President / Public Policy  
NEWS MEDIA ALLIANCE  
4401 N. Fairfax Drive, Ste. 300  
Arlington, VA 22203  
571-366-1150  
[paul@newsmediaalliance.org](mailto:paul@newsmediaalliance.org)

Adrian White Slagle  
Vice President, Marketing & Supporter Experience  
Operation Smile  
3641 Faculty Boulevard  
Virginia Beach, VA 23453  
(757) 321-7778  
[awhite@operationasmile.org](mailto:awhite@operationasmile.org)

Donna Hanbery  
Counsel  
Pacific Northwest Association of Want Ad Papers  
(PNWAWAP)  
304 W 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave  
Spokane, WA 99210  
612-340-9350  
[hanbery@hnclaw.com](mailto:hanbery@hnclaw.com)

Pierce Myers  
Executive Vice President  
Parcel Shippers Association  
320 South West Street, Suite 110  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703-627-5112  
[pierce@parcelshippers.org](mailto:pierce@parcelshippers.org)

Michael Makin  
President & CEO  
Printing Industries of America  
1325 G Street NW, Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
202-627-6924  
[mmakin@printing.org](mailto:mmakin@printing.org)

Phillip S. Thompson  
Director Postal Affairs  
Quad/Graphics  
N61 W23044 Harry's Way  
Sussex, WI 53089  
(414) 566-4731  
[pthompson@gg.com](mailto:pthompson@gg.com)

Donna Hanbery  
Executive Director  
Saturation Mailers Coalition  
33 South 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 4160  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
612-340-9350  
[hanbery@hnclaw.com](mailto:hanbery@hnclaw.com)

Paley Rothman  
General Counsel  
Small Business Legislative Council, Inc.  
4800 Hampden Lane, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
301-652-8302

Donna Hanbery  
Counsel  
Southeastern Advertising Publishers Association  
(SAPA)  
P.O. BOX 456  
Columbia, TN 38402  
612-340-9350  
[hanbery@hnclaw.com](mailto:hanbery@hnclaw.com)

Donna Hanbery  
Counsel  
Wisconsin Community Papers (WCP)  
101 S Main St  
Fond du Lac, WI 54935  
612-340-9350  
[hanbery@hnclaw.com](mailto:hanbery@hnclaw.com)

René C. Bardorf  
Senior Vice President of Government and Community  
Relations  
Wounded Warrior Project  
1120 G Street NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
202-558-4301  
[rbardorf@woundedwarriorproject.org](mailto:rbardorf@woundedwarriorproject.org)

Neal Denton, CAE  
SVP, Chief Government Affairs Officer  
Government Relations and Policy  
YMCA OF THE USA  
1129 20th Street N.W., #301  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
800-932-9622  
[neal.denton@ymca.net](mailto:neal.denton@ymca.net)

February 27, 2018

## Attachment A

The parties below have requested that they be identified as supporting the Comments of the American Mail Alliance:

Action Unlimited  
Ad Pages Savings Magazines  
All Island Media  
Arandell Corp.  
BGE, Ltd.  
Eastern Marketing Services  
Engel Printing & Publishing Co. Inc  
Everything Marketing, LLC  
Exchange Media Group  
Freedom Graphics  
Genesee Valley Publications  
Harte Hanks  
Hartford Courant Media Group  
Hersam Acorn Network/ Newspapers  
Herald Community Newspapers  
Mailbox Merchants  
Main Street, Inc.  
MSPark  
National Mail It, LLC  
PrimeTime Guide  
Publishers Clearing House  
Richner Communications Inc.  
Richner Printing & Mailing  
Signature Graphics, Inc.  
Smart Market, LLC  
Sun Community News and Printing  
Target Marketing  
Target Direct/ Upper Valley Press  
Town Money Saver  
Trumbull Printing, LLC  
Western News & Info, Inc.  
Wilen Direct  
Yankee Pennysaver